

baleful influence on the Cleveland administration, is prominent in the Parker contingent in Connecticut, and you will find in your own state and throughout the country that his most enthusiastic champions are the men who openly opposed our ticket in 1896. The trust magnates, the great bankers and the railroad attorneys would not be so unanimous in his support if they did not have secret assurances in regard to his position. Those who, like you and I, believe that the best interests of the country require President Roosevelt's defeat at the coming election must consider two questions—first, can a democratic victory be secured by an ambiguous platform and a tongue-tied candidate? and second, would a victory under such conditions bring us the change desired? To answer the first question we have only to remember the party's experience in 1894. The men who seek to regain control of the party were then in absolute control. Mr. Cleveland was president, his cabinet was "pure gold," and the members of the national committee were in full sympathy with his administration, and yet our party was defeated in the congressional contest by 1,080,000 votes. Whether measured by the popular vote, by the number of states carried or by the number of congressmen elected, the defeat of '94 was more disastrous than the defeat in '96 or in 1900. If this defeat occurred before the open desertion of Mr. Cleveland and his political sympathizers, what would be the result if the party should now go into a campaign on a meaningless platform and under the leadership of one justly suspected of representing Mr. Cleveland's political views? You remember that Mr. Cleveland's administration lost us some of the southern states, and created a very active opposition to the democratic party in nearly all the others and this, too, notwithstanding the overshadowing influence exerted by the race question. Even from the standpoint of expediency it would, it seems to me, be criminal folly to throw away the chances of success by putting the party in a doubtful position on public questions or under doubtful leadership. The more anxious we are to defeat the republicans the more careful we ought to be to put the party in a position where it would deserve success, for it would be a reflection upon the patriotism and intelligence of the country to assume that there is any better way to insure success than to deserve it.

But even if it were possible to suppose that victory could be won by marshaling the six millions of voters under the three hundred thousand deserters (as you estimate them) what would the victory amount to? The men who deserted the party are really more antagonistic to democratic principles than the average republican. Many republicans oppose the democratic party simply because of their allegiance to the republican party, but those who left the democratic party in '96 showed that their hostility to democracy was strong enough to make them disregard political ties and political associations. Mr. Cleveland did the democratic party more harm than any republican president has been able to do it. He fastened upon the party responsibility for his betrayal of both the party and the people. I am sure you will agree with me when I say that in both campaigns (1896 and 1900) his administration, although our party attempted to repudiate it, did more to defeat our party than the active opposition of himself and of such subordinates as he could coerce.

The trouble with President Roosevelt's administration is that it is on the side of plutocracy as against democracy, on the side of organized wealth as against the masses, and if by any possibility we should elect another democratic president controlled by the influences that controlled Mr. Cleveland, what assurance have we that he would attempt to undo what recent republican presidents have done? The reorganizers are as clearly and as completely controlled by the monopolists as are the republican leaders, and with one of their representatives in the White house we could confidently expect the appointment of supreme court judges who, like the three gold democrats now on the supreme bench, would decide against the power of congress to protect the public from industrial monopolies. These judges could block remedial legislation for years to come.

Instead of a plan of evasion and surrender, which would add disgrace to defeat in case of defeat, and would disappoint the people even if it won, the party should, I think, make an honest and democratic fight against all the republican policies. I can not believe that the democratic party will throw away the great opportunity it

now has to make a successful attack on the strongholds of republicanism—not by trying to win back by fatal concessions corporation-controlled democrats, but by appealing to the conscience of the country and to the patriotism of the people. We can neither draw honest men to the party nor arouse enthusiasm among our own people by showing a greater desire for "winning" than for principles. If we refuse to declare a definite purpose before the election no one will expect us to do so after the election. If our policies are really wise, the more clearly they are stated the better, for truth like good seed will yield abundantly.

Most earnestly believing that the corporation element now seeking to regain control of the democratic party would lead the party not only to defeat but to disastrous defeat, and believing that a democratic administration controlled by these influences would disappoint the democrats of the country and delay the triumph of real democracy, I am doing all in my power to maintain the integrity of the democratic party, and prevent a surrender to the corporations. I can not claim to love my party better than you love it, nor can I ask you to substitute my judgment for your own, but during the last twelve years I have become intimately acquainted with the purposes, the plans, and the methods of those who are now leading the reorganization movement, and believing them to be a serious menace to the party's welfare as well as to the country's good, I must continue to oppose them in season and out of season. It would be a source of great encouragement to me if in this struggle I felt that I had the active cooperation of all who, like yourself, have been loyal to the party in recent campaigns. But if I can not have it I shall console myself with the belief that events will vindicate my course and prove to those who have trusted me that in this contest I am only doing my duty as I have tried to do it in preceding contests.

In conclusion allow me to assure you of my high esteem and to express the hope that you may live to rejoice in the triumph of a real democracy and to see the country in the full enjoyment of its blessings.

As you gave your letter to the press, I am sure that you will not object to the publication of this.

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

### Will Shaw Explain?

Secretary Shaw has talked enough to earn the distinction of being the mouthpiece of the Roosevelt administration but he now has ample reason to do some talking in his own behalf. He has become the central figure in an official scandal which, until it is cleared up, will monopolize his vocal powers. A Des Moines dispatch relates that there is "information on file in the governor's office" there showing that Secretary Shaw, when governor, paroled a desperate criminal at the request of political leaders and for political purposes—and the evidence further shows that the parole was granted in spite of the remonstrance of the trial judge and prosecuting attorney. Dave Mercer, a republican congressman, was a candidate for re-election in the Omaha district and wanted the aid of the gang to which the prisoner belonged. Mr. Hubbard, the political boss who found Governor Shaw and engineered his nomination, wrote a letter to the governor and called attention to the service which Mercer had rendered to "us" in passing "the bill for the settlement of the Sioux City and Pacific indebtedness." Hubbard adds: "I suppose there is no doubt that he (the prisoner) is guilty of the crime charged but Dave says he has been punished pretty well now and that it will be worth 300 or 400 votes to him from relatives of Sheriff if he can be paroled." AND HE WAS PAROLED. Secretary Shaw has been quick to warn the people against tariff reform and against any interference with the plans of the money changers; he has even given the country an occasional defense of the trusts. The country would now appreciate a dissertation upon the political use of executive clemency. With an Indiana governor shielding a republican indicted for murder and an Iowa governor paroling a convicted thief to aid a republican congressman it would seem that the republican party would soon cease to boast of its reverence for law and order. If Secretary Shaw exhibits a disinclination to throw light upon the subject the president might illumine one of his addresses on civic righteousness with a

discussion of the ethics of the Hubbard letter. The "grand old party" must be nearing the end of its usefulness if a criminal must be paroled to reward a republican congressman for supporting a railroad measure. And if Secretary Shaw thus abused his former executive authority is he not likely to abuse his present authority to reward the Wall street magnates who are expected to finance the republican campaign?

### Labor's Splendid Example.

The press dispatches tell of the action of the Chicago Carriage Makers' Union in punishing a member who resorted to violence in dealing with a non-union man. John Bergquist was the offending member and his offense was an assault upon Harry T. Stevens a fellow workman who refused to join the union. Mr. Bergquist was fined twenty dollars by his association and then his union turned him over to the police court and fellow members furnished the evidence to convict him. The Inter Ocean says that the action was taken in pursuance of the policy adopted by the union. The carriage makers are to be congratulated; they have done more to make friends for organized labor than they could have done in any other way. A large majority of the people sympathize with the laboring man and are anxious to see him improve his conditions. The acts of lawlessness charged to strikers—though generally unjustly so—are the things relied upon by capitalists to alienate public sympathy. A single use of force is reiterated over and over again by the capitalistic press, and the criminal acts of irresponsible thugs and desperadoes are charged up to labor organizations. While it is impossible for the unions to entirely avoid misrepresentation the summary punishment by the unions themselves of members who attempt to take the law into their own hands is the most effective means they can employ to prove their respect for law and order. And why not be the first to punish? The union man does his fellows a grievous wrong and retards the legitimate work of his organization when he brings upon his order the odium which attaches to a law breaker. If all the organizations of labor will follow the example of the Chicago carriage makers' union the plain people will soon be massed in solid phalanx behind the laboring men and the capitalists who as managers of the great corporations are now defying the law will have a monopoly of the defense of lawlessness. Labor's cause is just and an appeal to the innate and universal sense of justice will finally win—violence is the only thing that can check it.

### Gage's Defense of Wealth.

Hon. Lyman J. Gage, formerly secretary of the treasury but now enjoying a rich banking berth which he earned by turning the treasury department over to Wall street, has recently made a defense of the accumulation of wealth. The occasion was a session of the Bible class of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. He said: "The men who have accomplished great things are the most poorly paid, no matter how rich they may be." Quoting a clergyman as saying that no man can acquire a million dollars in a lifetime without robbing some one, he said: "If the man who can make two blades of grass grow where one grew before takes to himself one-fourth of the increased product and lets three-fourths go to society, society gets a very good bargain." This is an unfortunate illustration because it does not state the situation which he is trying to defend. There is no criticism of those who really produce some thing. Society would not complain if the producer of an additional blade of grass kept it all. What society complains of—and justly, too—is that men who do not produce anything—men who add nothing to the world's wealth—saddle the masses and ride them with whip and spur. A great many of Mr. Gage's financial associates have grown rich by means of schemes of exploitation which do not differ in morals from the methods of the highwayman. Take, for instance, a trust that obtains a monopoly of a market. Its first act is usually to raise the price of the product, the second to reduce the price of the raw material and the third to impose harsher conditions upon employees. The managers of the trust do not increase the number of grass blades; they do not increase production. On the contrary they put into operation plans that must lead ultimately to an inferior product and decreased consumption. If a man learns that a